



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/004,055

01/02/90

HAMPTON

11

724741-1117

TAKES BPP, LLC, INC.  
BAKER & BOTT LLP  
THE WARNER BUILDING, 1000  
1200 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2400

HP12/0328

EXAMINER

LEARY, J.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1020

DATE MAILED:

03/28/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/444,459

Applicant(s)

CAMERON ET AL

Examiner

Louise N. Leary

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21-25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20, 26-29, and 32-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 30 and 31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

LOUISE N. LEARY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

1. Claims 1-54 are pending in this application.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20, 26-29, and 32-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Cook (US Patent 3,928,594).

Cook discloses a method of diagnosing the intensity of pain in a patient comprising determining the amount of cholinesterase in a biological sample from the patient. Cook also discloses methods for treating the symptoms and signs associated with demyelinating processes or other conditions in man characterized by defective neural transmission with an acetylcholine-cholinesterase imbalance due to relative decrease in cholinesterase activity. See the Abstract and column 2, lines 34-66. In addition, Cook discloses methods for administering pharmaceutical compositions to alleviate pain associated with cholinesterase imbalance(s) in the patients with

pathological central nervous system (i.e., brain and spine) or spinal cord conditions. See column 5, lines 2-29, and column 6, lines 1-28. Thus, Cook discloses all the limitations claimed except for describing the use of electrophoretic separation in the methods.


However, the examiner can not determine whether the Cook reference inherently possesses an electrophoretic method step as claimed in the instant invention. It is noted that Cook discloses methods of diagnosing the intensity of a pain perceived by a patient comprising determining the amount of a neurotransmitter or cholinesterase, pharmaceutical compositions and methods for treating patients with pathological central nervous system (i.e., brain and spine) or spinal cord conditions which anticipates or renders obvious the present invention. Thus, the burden of proof is on applicant to show patentably distinct differences between the invention claimed and the subject matter disclosed by the Cook reference.

3. Claims 21-25 are allowable over the prior art of record.

4. Claims 30-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The Yang et al reference (Anesthesiology, V88(2), p334, (1998)(Abstract Only) disclose a method for diagnosing pain in a patient and evaluated patients injected with acetylcholinesterase inhibitor and has been cited to further show the state of this art.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Louise N. Leary at telephone number (703) 308-3533.

  
LOUISE N. LEARY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 20, 2001